* Wherefore, it is manifest, that there is some such thing as that which we call nature ;— that is, that there is not only an artificial, methodical, and plastic nature in animals, by which their respective bodies are framed and conserved; but also, that there is such a general plastic nature likewise in the universe, by which the heavens and whole world are thus artificially ordered and disposed.

24. Now whereas Aristotle, in the forecited words,-tells us, that we partake of life and •understanding from that in the universe, after the same manner as we partake of heat and cold from that heat and cold that is in the universe; it is observable, that this was a notion borrowed from Socrates (afc we understand both from Xenophon and Plato); that philosopher having used it as an argumentation to prove a Deity. And the sense of it is represented after this manner by the Latin poet:[a]

> • Principle coelum ac terrain,
> camposque liqucntcs,
> Lucentemque globum lunae,
> Titaniaque astra, Spiritus intus
> alit, totosque infusa per artus,
> **Mens** agitat ioolein, et magno se
> corpore miscet Jnde hominum
> pecudumque genus, vitaeque
> volantftm.

From whence it may fie collected, that Aristotle did suppose this plastic nature of the universe to be 17 jtupoe ^wynfc, *J *w avsv 4>ᵛws,* either part of some mundane soul,—that was also conscious and intellectual (as that plastic nature in animals is), or at least some inferior principle, depending on such a soul.—And indeed whatever the doctrine of the modern Peripatetics be, we make no doubt at all but that Aristotle himself held the world's animation, or a mundane soul: forasmuch as he plainly

* Virgil. JEncid. lib. vi. ycrs. 724.